

S/N 10/811,287

Response to Office Action Dated 10/05/2005

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the finding of allowability in claims 2-4, 6-18, 21-23, and 25-30 and respectfully requests consideration and allowance of the subject application.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-34 were previously pending.

Claims 2, 6, 9, 12, 19, 21, 22, and 25-30 have been amended.

Claims 1, 5, 20, 23-24, and 31-34 are canceled.

No new claims are added.

Claims 2-4, 6-19, 21-22, and 25-30 are pending.

To advance prosecution of the patent application to allowance, Applicant requests that claims 1, 5, 20, 23, 24, and 31-34 be canceled without prejudice. The rejections of canceled claims 1, 5, 20, 24, and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by USPGP 2002/0148347 to Herberger et al., are moot in view of their cancellation.

**Objections to Dependent Claims**

The Office objected to claims 2-4 and claims 6-18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Office would allow these claims if they were rewritten to include limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

S/N 10/811,287

Response to Office Action Dated 10/05/2005

Claim 2

Claim 2 has been rewritten as an independent claim that includes all of the limitations of base claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 2 is now allowable, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 3- 4

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 2, and dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Because claim 2 has been rewritten as an independent claim to overcome objection, Applicant submits that claims 3-4 are now allowable.

Claim 6

Claim 6 has been rewritten as an independent claim that includes all of the limitations of base claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 6 is now allowable, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 7-8

Claims 7-8 depend from claim 6, and dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Because claim 6 has been rewritten as an independent claim to overcome objection, Applicant submits that claims 7- 8 are now allowable.

S/N 10/811,287

Response to Office Action Dated 10/05/2005

Claim 9

Claim 9 was rewritten as an independent claim that includes all of the limitations of base claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 9 is now, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 10-11

Claim 10 depends from claim 9, and claim 11 depends from claim 10. Dependent claims contain language of the claims from which they depend. Because claim 9 was rewritten as an independent claim to overcome objection, Applicant submits that claims 10-11 are now allowable.

Claim 12

Claim 12 was rewritten as an independent claim that includes all of the limitations of base claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 12 is now allowable, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 13-18

Claims 13-18 depend from claim 12. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Because claim 12 has been rewritten as an independent claim to overcome objection, Applicant submits that claims 13-18 are now allowable.

S/N 10/811,287

Response to Office Action Dated 10/05/2005

Rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

The Office rejected claims 9-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The Office would allow claims 21-23 and claims 25-30 if rewritten to overcome this § 112 second paragraph rejection and if rewritten as independent claims to include limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 19

Claim 19 is amended to contain uniform language throughout the claim directed toward a “method” in order to overcome the Office’s 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph rejection. Claim 19 is also rewritten to include the limitation of claim 23. The Office would allow claim 23 if rewritten to include its base claim, which is claim 19. Hence, amended claim 19 is the same as claim 23 would have been if rewritten to include its base claim. Applicant submits that claim 19 is now allowable.

Claims 21-23, 25-30

Claims 21-23 and 25-30 are amended to include uniform language directed toward a “method” in order to overcome the Office’s 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph rejection. Claim 25 is rewritten to include the limitation of claim 24, and dependency changed from claim 24 to base claim 19.

Claims 21-23 and 25-30 depend from claim 19, rewritten to be allowable. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend.

S/N 10/811,287

Response to Office Action Dated 10/05/2005

Because claim 19 is now allowable, Applicant submits that dependent claims 21-23 and 25-30 are also allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully suggests that claims 2-4, 6-19, 21-22, and 25-30 are in condition for allowance and requests issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 10-20-05

By: 

Lee & Hayes PLLC  
Mark C. Farrell  
Reg. No. 45,988  
(509) 324-9256